

## Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Revised Request ☐
 Application No.: 10/047248 First Named Applicant: Himmel  
 Examiner: Vu, Kicu D Art Unit: 2173 Status of Application: Non-Final OA

Tentative

(1) Mark S. Walker (Atty for assignee) (2) \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

 RECEIVED  
 CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
 Participants:

AUG 11 2005

Proposed Date of Interview: 8/17/05Proposed Time: 2 PM EDT (AM/PM)

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic(2) ☐ Personal(3) ☐ Video ConferenceExhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☒ YES ☐ NOIf yes, provide brief description: See attached proposed amendment to claim 1

## Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Discussed	Agreed	Prior Art	Not	Agreed
(1) <u>102 rej</u>	_____	_____	_____	<u>Shuster</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) <u>103 rej</u>	_____	_____	_____	<u>Shuster/Dorian</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☒ Continuation Sheet Attached

## Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

Shuster does not teach each and every claimed element of amended claim. No motivation to  
combine Shuster and Dorian. Combination would be inoperable. (see attached)

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on \_\_\_\_\_.

## NOTE:

This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Mark S. Walker (Tel: 512-823-5884)

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

30699

Examiner/SPE Signature

Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing this form, call 1-800-PTO-0100 and select option 3.

Ser. No. 10/047248

Proposed Amendment

AUS92001122US1

Filed: 01/16/2002

**Proposed Amendment**

1. (Currently Amended) A method for managing web content displayed at a client device during one or more browser sessions comprising:

responsive to a request for a first web page, displaying the first web page at the client device through a browser session;

determining a first user specified timeout condition for said browser session;

detecting a timeout condition in the browser session; and

displaying a second ~~predetermined~~ user specified web page at the client device.

**Discussion**

This claim, as amended, is respectfully submitted to be patentable over the cited art. This claim 1 now includes elements similar to those in Claim 7 of the original application.

**35 USC §102**

This claim is patentable over Shuster because Shuster does not teach all elements of the claim. Shuster is directed to an advertising system that sends unsolicited material from a server when a user computer is inactive. The user has no control over the time or what is displayed and inclusion of those features would render Shuster inoperable for its intended purpose.

**35 USC §103**

Shuster and Dorian do not teach or suggest this claim either singly or in combination. Furthermore, there is no motivation to combine these references. Dorian is directed to a parental control system in which only preapproved web pages are displayed. The preapproved list is stored on a server and controls which pages are downloaded to the client machine. Shuster is specifically directed to displaying unsolicited information on the client system. There is no motivation to add the preapproval features of Dorian since these would frustrate the purpose of Shuster to display unsolicited material. Similarly, since Dorian is directed at controlling what is displayed at the client, its purpose would be frustrated by permitting display of unsolicited content.